

EVERGREEN ♦ EAST HILLS VISION STRATEGY

Task Force Meeting - 11

Carolyn Clark School; Multi-Purpose Room
3701 Rue Mirassou
San Jose, CA 95148

Saturday, August 19, 2006
9:00A.M – 12:00P.M.

MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

Task Force Members Present:

Chair Dave Cortese, Vice-chair Nora Campos, Chris Corpus, Ike White, J. Manuel Herrera, Homing Yip, Vince Songcayawon, Sylvia Alvarez, Steve Dunn, Al Munoz, Patrick Spillane, Mark Milioto, Joe Head, Mike Hill, Lou Kvitek, Alan Covington, Bob Levy, Carlos DaSilva, Gordon Lund, Steven Cox, George Perez

Task Force Members Absent:

James Zito, Kahn Nguyen, Carolyn Gonot, Dave Zanker, Jenny Chang, Maria Lopez, Melanie Richardson, Nancy Dellamattera

Members of the Public Present:

Galvin D. Jackson, Dallas Clark, Javier Gonzalez (District 7), Alan Goudfalo, Mike Alvarado, Bridgit Kouer, Frank Biehl, Dan Gould, Carol Ashman, Carol Rosen, Charles Perrotta, Tony Seebach, Hoy Li, Jose Aranda, Patrick Hendry, Lillian Jones, Mahmood Gnor

Developer Community Present:

Bridget Koller, Mike Keeney, Bob Hencken

Staff Present:

Laurel Prevetti, Andrew Crabtree, John Baty, Dave Mitchell, Michael Mena

Welcome and Announcements

Chair Dave Cortese called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Meeting Summaries

Laurel Prevetti, Deputy Director of the Planning Division, asked the Task Force members to reference and accept the meeting summary for the June 19th Task Force meeting (also available on the EEHVS website).

Task Force member Alan Covington stated that the summary for the “Housing Unit Exercise” used the statement about not wanting the Arcadia site to turn into an amenity dumping ground as

an interest for both higher and lower number of units. Mr. Covington noted that this statement should only be referenced for pushing the desired number of units on the Arcadia site to the lower end of the spectrum. Staff noted this clarification for the record.

Outreach Calendar

Laurel reminded the Task Force that the Outreach Calendar handout is also available on the EEHVS website and that the website is a good place to review all of the EEHVS related outreach meetings including meeting summaries.

Other Announcements

Laurel noted that staff distributed the First Amendment to the EEHVS Draft Environmental Impact Report to the Task Force and that it is also available on the EEHVS website. The First Amendment to the DEIR is a compilation of all the comments received during its circulation period for the DEIR, with responses to those comments. Laurel also noted that the Traffic Impact Fee and Nexus Study is near completion and would be available for public viewing soon. The Traffic Impact Fee and Nexus Study is a required study prepared in order to identify the appropriate linkage between an impact recreated by a specific development and the fee which would be used to mitigate the resulting impact(s).

Land Use Concepts/Alternatives

Laurel Prevetti proceeded to update the Task Force on the Land Use Concepts submitted by both the Task Force and the public as requested at the June 19th Task Force meeting. Staff also noted that approximately 40 land use concept/alternatives were composed and uploaded on the EEHVS website and were based on various comments and work products completed at several Task Force meetings, in addition to emails and letters submitted by both the Task Force and general public.

The submittal and review of approximately 40 different scenarios would be an unwieldy process for the Planning Commission and City Council to consider and therefore, staff requested that the Task Force take part in an exercise which will result in each member identifying their top two land use scenario preferences for each site. Planning staff prepared a “scorecard” as a suggested tool to assist the Task Force with this task. The suggested use of the “scorecard” allows the Task Force members to play planner for an evening and rate their preferred land use scenarios against the City Council’s 10 Expected Vision and Outcome Statements, the EEHVS Guiding Principles, and several relevant General Plan Policies and Goals. Laurel finished the presentation with a request that the Task Force submit their top two (2) land use scenarios at the August 30th Task Force meeting. The results will be discussed in detail at the September meeting. The item was then opened for comments and questions from the Task Force.

The Chair, Dave Cortese, stated that although 40 scenarios (including the developer's proposals) were compiled, it is better than the infinite number we have been working with so far. This will help distil down to the best scenarios/alternatives by seeing commonalities in the various proposals.

Finish the Housing Unit Exercise from the June 19th Task Force Meeting

Introduction

Michael Mena continued the discussion from the June 19th Task Force meeting and re-explained the purpose of the housing unit exercise. The agenda item was needed to scope the Task Force's recommendation on the range of dwelling units that may be acceptable on each of the four opportunity sites. All of the opportunity sites with the exception of the Industrial sites were discussed at the previous meeting.

A "scaling" board was used to identify the preferred densities/unit counts for each site. Listed below are the interests of the Task Force that drove the "chips" on the board up or down to reflect the respective units desired for the industrial site. The interests identified by the Task Force fell into a category of higher density interest or lower density interest. Discussion of the other Opportunity Sites are included in the summary notes from the June 19th Task Force meeting.

Site 3 (Industrial) – Unit Range 0 to 1,950

*Interest that push for **higher** number of units:*

- *Joe Head* stated that the industrial site(s) is proposed to have the lowest density per acre than any of the other infill opportunity sites, and would contribute the least amount of impact on the existing roadways. Mr. Head also stated that it is the industrial site which would be funding the majority of the "amenity" package, including the transportation improvements.
- *Steve Dunn* felt that the conversion of the industrial to residential provides the greatest opportunity to acquire money for implementing the amenities list. Steve Dunn, who stated that he has been in the industrial business for 30+ years, can confirm that the industrial land in the Evergreen area is not the most efficient use for this site.
- *Steven Cox* supported the conversion of the industrial land, sighting that it is in the wrong location and is not a viable use in this area of the city; however, no specific range of units were recommended.

*Interest that push for **lower** number of units:*

- *Ike White* and *Al Munoz* both preferred to have a lower number of units to avoid traffic generated impacts.
- *Sylvia Alvarez* commented that she is in favor of preserving as much industrial land as possible and encouraged the incorporation of some affordable housing on the site. Ms. Alvarez was in support of smaller residential lots to achieve this goal. *Sylvia Alvares* also stated that she lives across from the development proposed for the industrial properties and

from her observation, the cost of homes today would encourage more multi-family built on the site which would result in additional impacts on traffic and the local schools.

- *Homing Yip* preferred that the industrial site(s) develop at a lower density in order to reduce traffic impacts. Mr. Yip also stated that the proposed number of units would equate to a density that is at least two times the density of the surrounding/adjacent community and would not reflect the existing character of the area.
- *Bob Levy* stated that he is a firm believer in retaining the industrial land in the Evergreen area and protecting the existing Hitachi use. Mr. Levy stated that it seems the traffic impacts, even with the “improvements,” would be a wash and that we [city] should be looking at impacts on the greater citywide network. Mr. Levy remains unclear whether a high school is needed or not.
- *Lou Kvitek* stated that he is not in favor of any development on the industrial land if it will not accommodate a high school. The industrial site(s) is the only site that is large enough to accommodate a high school. The developer should be under direct contract with the school district to ensure the availability of land.
- *Mark Milioto* restated the need for a high school is key with development of the industrial site. Mr. Milioto stated that he is opposed to development on the industrial that is not compatible with the surroundings (existing industrial building is not compatible). Mr. Milioto feels that the site is probably better suited for residential uses, but any new uses must be compatible with the surrounding densities of the existing neighborhoods.
- *Vince Songcayawon* stated that from his real estate experience there is not a strong need for industrial development, but there is current need and will have future need for office space.

Other comments:

- *Gordon Lund* stated that he prefers an alternative that would preserve the industrial lands and find alternative sources for highway improvements. There is a need to preserve land both for jobs and a high school to achieve a balanced community. The comments stated were not clear whether preservation of the industrial meant a reduced number of units on the sites or whether there should be the same number of units proposed by the developers (1,950 dwelling units).
- *Patrick Spillane* stated that the Task Force and city should be looking more closely at the “trade-offs.” Higher density development would help yield smaller and more affordable homes; while lower density development means larger lots and less affordable units.
- *Alan Covington* requested that the historical industrial conversion information, previously requested by the Task Force, be presented in order the Task Force to make an educated recommendation on the issue. Mr. Covington also inquired on the State’s Transportation Bond scheduled for the November ballot and what impact that would have, if any, on the

project and the proposed amenities. Laurel Prevetti responded to this question by stating that preliminary discussions indicate that approval of the Bond could provide partial funding for the Highway 101 improvements. Without knowing whether the bond will pass or not, the Task Force is charged with trying to “balance the equation” with the current/known variables.

- *Chair Dave Cortese* identified that he and Co-Chair Nora Campos are representatives on the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) Board of Directors. The Task Force Chair stated that he has reviewed the capital budget for the VTA and it states that the VTA has a current budget short-fall of \$4 billion for its preferred projects, of which \$2 billion is allocated to the BART extension to the south bay.

Laurel Prevetti wrapped up the conversation by confirming that the range of housing on the industrial site remains a wide variable from zero units to the developer proposed 1,950 units. Laurel Prevetti went on to introduce Andrew Crabtree who would present/facilitate the discussion for school facility needs.

School Facility Needs

Andrew Crabtree framed the discussion for this item by stating that the development proposed as part of the EEHVS affects various schools districts and would like to offer each district the opportunity to continue identifying what their needs will be as a result of the proposed development.

Evergreen Elementary School District

Cliff Black, representing the Evergreen Elementary School District, was the first presenter on this topic with John Diffenderfer (architect) and Jim Crawford. Cliff Black acknowledged that the school district did coordinate with the developers, the City, , and the community regarding the placement of an elementary school near the existing Meadow Fair Park site. Cliff Black went on to state that a total of 21 acres would be needed on the industrial site with open space for soccer fields and baseball fields. Mr. Black also stated that additional housing on the College site could be served by existing school facilities. The school district has also been in discussion with the City’s Parks Division to discuss possible joint-use facilities with a new 40,000 square foot community center located adjacent to the elementary school site.

The school district’s architect, John Diffendorfer, presented two (2) development scenarios with a new elementary school and community center on the Arcadia site. Additionally, Jim Crawford, discussed the financing needed for the development of a new elementary school. Mr. Crawford stated that the district is assuming that the development will not burden the district financially and after acquiring all traditional financing available the district would be looking at an approximate \$30 million dollar shortfall. This shortfall is expected to be made up by the developers.

Mount Pleasant Unified School District

George Perez stated that the only opportunity site impacting the Mount Pleasant School District is the former Pleasant Hills Golf Course site. Mr. Perez stated that the “critical mass/ tipping point” for requiring a new elementary school would be a minimum of 600 homes built on the subject site. Mr. Perez went on to state that the school would need to serve kindergarten through eighth grade.

East Side Unified High School District

Mr. Herrera, President of the ESUHSD, and the district’s representative, Mr. Ruiz, stated that the proposed developments impacting their school district would generate an estimated 1,100 students. Mr. Ruiz stated that a new high school could only be justified if the new student generation was above 1,800 students. Since the anticipated student generation of the proposed development would not meet this “critical mass/tipping point” the district would not be looking to construct a new high school as a result of the proposed development. There is capacity to accommodate the future development within existing facilities and the district is looking at reprogramming their existing facilities to adjust student population at each facility.

Task Force Comments/Questions

Task Force *Chair Dave Cortese* stated that the community center “hub” concept for the Arcadia site was concerning, given the fact that the City Council has rejected a plan that would require the closing of the Meadow Fair and the Evergreen Community Centers. Mr. Cortese also clarified that land dedicated for school use, must first be dedicated to the City and then transferred to the appropriate school district. Therefore, the land would be secured for other public uses should the associated school district not construct a new facility.

Chair Cortese was also concerned with any combination of little league fields with school uses and suggested exploring construction of ESUHSD facilities and the under utilized ESUHSD existing facilities. Additionally, the Chair recommended that the district take into account all new or anticipated development in their district rather than just in the EDP area when considering whether or not a new high school may or may not be needed.

Co-Chair, Nora Campos, also commented and suggested that the Mount Pleasant Unified School District also consider all pending and potential development when considering whether a new school is warranted or not and not look solely the development on the former golf course site.

Lou Kvitek stated that schools are a significant issue and should not be rushed. The EEHVS work plan should be pushed out in order to allow sufficient time to resolve the education issues for the kids and community. Mr. Kvitek was concerned with the “critical mass/tipping point” criteria the school districts work with and wanted to ensure that we are addressing schools as they relate to the EEHVS Guiding Principles. Mr. Kvitek was also concerned that there are too many students located on a single campus which results student neglect.

Mark Milioto concurred with Mr. Kvitek's comments stating that quality of life and education is more important than capacity discussions. Mr. Milioto was also concerned that sports fields have been short changed in the area and wanted to reiterate that any development of little league fields would be self-sufficient.

Co-Chair Nora Campos reminded the Task Force that the project's work plan (schedule) is set by the City Council. Requests for consideration on the project's work plan should be directed to the City Council for consideration.

Bob Levy stated that the process should be looking 50 years out from now and should consider "banking" land for future public uses, whether it be for future schools or other public/quasi-public uses. Mr. Levy asked the school district to confirm what amount of land would be needed for a school. *Alan Garofalo*, for the ESUHSD, stated that a school of approximately 2,500 students would need a 47 to 53 acre site.

Carlos De Silva commented on the West Evergreen Neighborhood Advisory Committee's (WE/NAC) skepticism regarding the proposed development. Mr. De Silva wanted to ensure that a school and community center facility is presented to the West Evergreen SNI for input prior to approval. Mr. De Silva stated that the WE/NAC is concerned over the "hub" community center idea and is not in favor of little league fields or an aquatic center located on the Arcadia site. The WE/NAC is in favor of a public pool facility for the local community.

Gordon Lund suggested the school districts consider a "satellite" school facility where teachers and janitorial services can be shared to meet the demand.

Ike White asked the question on the status of the school district's "No Child Left Behind" policy? Mr. White also wanted confirmation on where the school district's tax money and impact fees are spent ... in the same district boundary of the impacted district? Will it be used to buy the land need for new facilities?

George Lopez stated that the Mount Pleasant District has looked at projections to the year 2010 within its district boundaries. Also take into consideration the patterns of growth with both multi-family and single-family developments.

Mr. Ruiz, representing the ESUHSD, stated that the school district stated that the district may need a new head quarters/office at a new location. The district believes they should not be held responsible for the burden of construction a new facility. Mr. Ruiz also responded to the comments that the districts should not only consider capacity when looking at triggers for new schools but should be looking at quality of education. Mr. Ruiz stated that quality of education is important to the districts; however, reality is that funding availability is strictly tied to the capacity triggers and is not a negotiable criterion. The district is looking at a comprehensive review if its facility programming to address new students that would result from the proposed developments.

Cliff Black, of the EESD, stated that there was a lot of coordination between the City and the school district, thinking in and out of the box, to come up with a plan that met the needs of both. Mr. Black was surprised to hear that the City Council was not in support of the “hub” concept and was willing to go back to the community with the original plan for a new elementary school next to Meadow Fair Park. Mr. Black’s comments concluded the discussion on the school facility needs agenda item.

Categorizing Amenities

John Baty, Planner with the City of San Jose, requested that the Task Force participate in an exercise to prioritize the list of possible amenities that could be constructed as part of the EEHVS project. The amenity list is intended to be an all-inclusive list of public facility projects/improvements that have been identified at various EEHVS Task Force meetings, community meetings, or are identified as priority projects within the City of San Jose’s Greenprint and SNI Improvement Plans.

The goal of the exercise is to place specific amenities in “baskets” as the Task Force’s top (5) five “must haves”, “important”, “nice to have”, and “others/least priority.” This list of amenities is then intended to be incorporated into the revised/updated Evergreen Development Policy and Phasing Plan for the proposed development of the four (4) Opportunity Sites and the Evergreen Pool units. This item was then opened to the Task Force for questions and comments.

Task Force Questions/Comments

Ike White was concerned that he did not see potential amenities that were requested at various Pleasant Hill community workshops. Laurel Prevetti (City Planning Division) stated that there was room at the bottom of the list/scorecard for anyone to add items that staff had not included or other amenities that members of the Task Force would like to see.

Mark Milioto stated that the Evergreen Little League (item “A”) on the list is not intended to be a shared facility with other sports. Mr. Milioto also wanted to remind other members of the Task Force that schools were not included on the amenity list and that youth activities are an important item.

Carlos De Silva, representing the West Evergreen NAC/SNI, stated that their neighborhood association did not support having an adult sports complex (item “K”) constructed on the Arcadia Site.

George Perez stated that he was concerned that the descriptions of each amenity were not clear enough and wanted more clarification of each.

Vince Songcayawon stated that amenities on the Pleasant Hills Golf Course site and the Arcadia site are intended to be fully dedicated; and amenity locations on the Campus Industrial site will be partially dedicated, requiring some cost to purchase land.

Homing Yip stated that he is in support of making use of shared facility as appropriate.

Bob Levy identified concern as to the cost of each amenity and the accuracy of each.

Co-Chair Nora Campos asked staff how they would address concerns from Task Force members regarding completeness of the amenity list. *Laurel Prevetti* responded by informing the Task Force that staff would be contacting individuals to resolve any missing items.

Alan Covington requested that the amenity prioritization exercise be extended in order to allow additional review and clarification by staff. *Laurel Prevetti* explained that staff would allow additional time, but that it would impact the amount of review and information that would be included in the 2nd Draft of the Evergreen Development Policy.

Public Comments

Attendees of the Task Force meeting, *Frank Biehl*, *Mike Alvarado*, *Carol Ashmen*, and *Delores Gatherwright*, spoke during the public comment period of the agenda. Additional *Dave Mitchell* (PRNS) also addressed the Task Force. The public comments at the meeting addressed the following issues:

- Importance of an elementary school constructed next to the existing Meadow Fair Park.
- Need to consider use of certain amenities by all residence and not focus on specific uses or ages (i.e., sports fields).
- Traffic issues will not be contained only within District 8, but will spill over into other districts and neighborhoods.

Dave Mitchell (PRNS) stated that the City of San Jose's Greenprint, a strategy plan adopted by the City Council, included a 40,000 square foot community center and was also included in the West Evergreen SNI Improvement Plan.

Additional Task Force Comments

Lou Kviteck wanted to respond to comments by the ESUHSD regarding if the district were to sell their administrative building site and move to another location. *Mr. Kviteck* disagreed with the district and stated that any administrative facility should be co-located with a high school campus. Additionally noted, was that several students are currently located in portable buildings which is not acceptable.

Al Munoz showed additional concerns regarding the amenity list and its lack of including items requested at the Pleasant Hills workshop.

Vice-Chair *Nora Campos* adjourned the meeting at 12:15 p.m.